

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Ki Il Kim)	Group Art Unit: 2617
Serial No.	10/719,363)	Examiner: GARY, ERIKA A.
Filed:	November 20, 2003)	
For:	MOBILE ENTERTAINMENT AND COMMUNICATION DEVICE)	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir/Madam:

On September 20, 2007, Applicant filed an "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form" to request an interview on September 27, 2007 with Examiner Temica Beamer in connection with the above-captioned application ("the '363 application"). The purpose of Applicant's requested interview was to address and resolve any issues in order to expedite re-allowance of the claims.

Examiner Beamer thereafter contacted Applicant and informed Applicant that she would not be able to conduct the interview due to her impending maternity leave. Therefore, no interview was conducted on September 27, 2007, as originally requested.

The '363 application was subsequently transferred to Examiner Erika A. Gary. Counsel for Applicant subsequently contacted Examiner Gary to schedule a telephone interview, and telephone interviews were held on October 15 and 16, 2007. At the conclusion of the telephone interviews, the Examiner indicated that she would prepare

an Interview Summary. Applicant is also submitting this Interview Summary in compliance with 37 CFR 1.133(3)(b) which requires the applicant to file "a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action."

During the telephone interviews, Applicant explained that the '363 application had previously been allowed but that Applicant filed a petition to withdraw the patent from issue in favor of filing a Request for Continued Prosecution ("RCE") and an Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS"), citing references that were called to Applicant's attention by third parties claiming materiality. While none of these references were believed to be material to the patentability of the pending claims, Applicant submitted these references in an IDS and the corresponding PTO-1449 form as an exercise of caution so as to permit the Examiner's consideration of the references.

The Examiner initially suggested that a restriction of the claims may be necessary so as to narrow the scope of the new search to be conducted. Applicant noted that the issue of a restriction requirement had already been resolved by the previous Examiner in the case and that the claims currently pending in the application were substantially the same, with the exception of certain narrowing and/or clarifying amendments made to the claims and that these claims had been allowed. Upon further consideration, the Examiner subsequently indicated that a search would be conducted on all of the independent claims and a restriction would not be issued, citing MPEP 706.04, that "[f]ull faith and credit should be given to the search and action of a previous

examiner unless there is clear error in the previous action or knowledge of other prior art.”

Amendments to the claims were also discussed and suggested. Specifically, Examiner suggested, and Applicant agreed to, the following claim amendments:

Claim 94: add recitation of “comprising” at the end of the preamble.

Claim 103: delete the recitation of “or” from the claim.

Claim 140: replace the recitation of “by telephone call” at the end of the claim with “to a remotely located telephone.”

Claim 141: delete the recitation of “an emergency telephone” at the end of the claim.

Claim 144: delete the recitation of “at least one of” and replace “Internet or remotely located telephones” with “Internet and remotely located telephones.”

The Examiner further indicated that amendments to at least claims 140, 141, 144, and 150 would need to be made to include the feature of being connected to the Internet. Applicant agreed and Examiner indicated that all such claim amendments would be made by Examiner’s amendment if the search failed to uncover any new prior art.

Upon completing the search, Examiner called Applicant to inform Applicant that the search did not uncover any new prior art and that a notice of allowance would be issued.

Applicant raised the issue of re-submitting an IDS, citing certain foreign references that had previously been cited in previous IDSs filed June 17, 2004 and July 12, 2004. The reason for the re-submission is that it was unclear whether the previous Examiner reviewing the case had initialed or crossed-out certain of the foreign patent references on the PTO 1449 form.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 17, 2007

Michelle C. Kim
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 51,881

CUSTOMER NUMBER
58688
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
355 South Grand Avenue
Suite 3150
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
(213) 787-2500